

COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XV. No. 11.] LONDON, SATURDAY, MARCH 18, 1809.

[Price 1s.

MR. SPENCER PERCEVAL, the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, receives £2,600 a year, in that capacity; for his office in the Treasury, £1,600 a year; as Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, £4,525 a year; as Surveyor of Meltings and Clerk of the Irons in the Mint, £126 a year; besides which, he has the grant in reversion, after the death of his brother, Lord Arden, of sinecure offices, or offices executed by deputy, of the *clear* value, according to their own statement, of £12,562 a year.—These facts, which are stated upon the authority of a Report, laid before the House of Commons, in the month of June last, shew, that this gentleman receives now, 8,851 pounds a year of the public money, and that, if his brother were now to die, he would be in the receipt of £21,413 a year of the public money.

385]

DUKE OF YORK.

(Continued from page 384.)

THE anxiously looked for discussion of the Evidence, relative to the Charges against the Duke of York, has, by this time (Tuesday) taken place; and, it will naturally be expected of me, that I offer some remarks upon that discussion. This I shall do; but, to go much into detail is impossible, and, indeed, would be useless. The general turn and complexion of the discussion, particularly noticing some characterizing features of it, is all that can be the subject of remark here; but, I think it necessary to state, that the whole of this important Debate, and also the whole of the Evidence and Documents produced by the Inquiry, will in the fullest manner, be inserted in my PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES, where the several Speeches will be recorded, in my usual manner, with the most scrupulous impartiality; and, I take this opportunity to notify, that any member, on either side, who may have a wish to have his speech recorded with particular accuracy, shall find his communications punctually and readily attended to.

Before I enter upon any observations upon the debate, as it relates to the great merits of the case, I cannot refrain from noticing a passage, in the speech of Mr. Adam, relating to *my own conduct*. It will be remembered, that, at page 227, in referring to the extraordinary rise of his son in the army, I pointed out the almost inevitable evils that must arise from the making of very young men commanding officers of regiments. In alluding to these remarks, MR. ADAM, in his speech of the 10th instant, “adverted to the pain, which some remarks, which had been made, in a weekly publication, upon his son’s promotion, had occasioned him, and regretted, that he had it not in his power to shew the House, that the *imputation* found-

ed upon what had been represented as a “scandalous circumstance, that the backs of a thousand men should be submitted to a youth, who had not yet attained the age of twenty one years,” so far from being justified in fact, was most *illiberal* and *unfair*, and that there was not a battalion in his majesty’s service, in which fewer corporal punishments were inflicted, or in which better military regulations were established.”—Now, I need not tell the discerning reader, that, when men find it difficult to rebut what is said, they, not unfrequently, are led to attack what is *not* said; and, in the first place, with respect to this complaint of Mr. Adam, after a careful examination of the passage complained of, I do not find, that I have denominated the speedy promotion of Colonel Adam “a scandalous circumstance.” But, in the next place, I am quite sure, that my words will not, in any hands upon earth, admit of being strained to mean, that the regiment, under the command of that gentleman, was cruelly treated, or that it suffered, in any way, from the circumstance of *his* having the command of it. The words were these: “At twenty-one years of age *no person in the world* can be fit for a Lieutenant Colonel. He has the absolute command of a thousand men. The comfort, the happiness, the morality, the backs of a thousand men depend upon his wisdom and integrity. A person to be intrusted with such a charge, ought to be sober, considerate, compassionate, and yet firm to execute justice. Where are these to be found united with the passions inseparable from youth? Besides, is it possible, that the other officers, captains old enough, perhaps, to be his father, and who have every fair claim to prior promotion, can cordially submit to the command, and, occasionally, to the *reproof*, of a boy of twenty-

N

[386

"one? What would Mr. Adam say, if he had to plead before a judge of twenty-one years of age? Yet, the Lieut.-Colonel of a Regiment (for the Colonel never commands) has powers still greater than those of a judge. He has, in the course of a year, to decide upon the cases of, perhaps, two thousand offences. He has to judge of characters; to weigh the merits of candidates for promotion; his smile is encouragement, and his frown disgrace; it depends upon him, whether the soldier's life be a pleasure or a curse. "Is not all this too much for the age of twenty-one years?" — Now, what "imputation" is there here upon Colonel Adam? Are not all the arguments general? And do they breathe sober common sense; dispassionate reason; or illiberality and unfairness? I am ready to allow, that there is a very great difference in young men; that the days of wisdom begin with some at an age when others ought still to be in leading strings; and, I believe, judging from the character of the father; considering the sort of education, the early habits of sobriety, and of all the moral virtues, which Col. Adam would, in all likelihood, have derived from the example of so good a man and so kind a parent; considering these things, I believe, that Col. Adam may have been as fit for the command of a regiment at the age of twenty-one, as many others at a much more advanced age. But, then, it is the danger of the precedent; and, the small chance that a youth of 21 should be so endowed. Besides, the passions of youth who is to quench, or to qualify? That zeal for the service, which is so necessary to constitute a good officer, may become mischievous, and greatly mischievous, if unrestrained by wisdom, and this sort of wisdom is not to be obtained without experience, which experience must, again, be indebted for its existence to years, and many years, of actual service. I myself, by a combination of rare circumstances, became possessed of great power over the greater part of a regiment, at the age of nineteen, I think it was; and, though I always acted for what I deemed the good of the service, I did many things, which I would not now do, if possessed of similar power. Always sober, always in good health, always up long before the sun, with limbs that never felt weary, with a body of iron, and a mind wholly wrapped up in the military service, I made no allowances for the weaknesses, or lukewarmness, of others. That zeal which I felt, I was disappointed at not

meeting with in every other breast. Not to run with pleasure at the call of the drum appeared to me as a sort of crime; when I should have considered, that the stimulus which I had, others had not, and that, therefore, to them should have been left other enjoyments. Greater application and zeal than I possessed; a more ardent and sincere desire to do good to the service, I defy Colonel Adam, or any man breathing, to possess; there was nothing that affected the credit of the regiment, which I did not feel more acutely than if it had affected myself. Yet, as I have grown in years; as I have experienced the feelings of husband and father, and as I have had occasion to contemplate the characters, the tempers, the causes of the vices and virtues of men, I have, many times, had to look back with sorrow at many of those acts, which proceeded from the best intentions; therefore, I am qualified to speak upon this matter, and think myself fully justified in the observations that I have made, not believing it to be at all likely, that, out of ten men of twenty one years of age, the nation should afford one more sober, more vigilant, or less likely to have his mind improperly biassed, than I was. — I have thus gone into my own case as an illustration, because I would leave nothing undone to shew, that I was not, in the remarks which appear to have given pain to Mr. Adam, actuated by any motive of "illiberality or unfairness," but solely by my conviction of the injurious consequences, which must arise, almost necessarily, from the committing of regiments to the command of such very young men. The law, which, in such matters, contains the accumulated wisdom of ages, denies to persons the possession of their own property, till they be twenty-one years of age; it denies them the liberty of choosing for themselves husbands and wives, until that age, before they have arrived at which, it denominates them *infants*; and, be it observed, that Mr. Adam's son was a *Major*, and, as such, was, of course, frequently the *commanding officer of a regiment*, at the age of *twenty*; for, it is notorious, that it seldom happens, that the Lieut. Col. and the Major are both present at the same time. — I shall conclude with declaring my sorrow at having given Mr. Adam pain; and, I think, that the public must be convinced, that I have, as far as my duty would allow me, avoided so doing. He is a gentleman, of whom I have heard much good, of whom, from no party or person, I never heard a word of harm in my life; there

are many circumstances in his progress through public life, which are highly honourable to him, and I myself am under great obligations to his wisdom, his talents, and his disinterestedness: but, if Mr. Adam will, for a moment, put himself in *my place*, I am sure he will say, that I could not have left unnoticed that which, with regard to him, I have noticed, and that my observations could not have been more lenient than they have been, without justly subjecting me to the charge of base partiality.

In entering upon the Debate, the first thing necessary is, to state, as correctly as it can now be done, the several propositions, that have been submitted for the adoption of the House. On the 8th of the month (Wednesday) MR. WARDLE, at the close of a speech, in which he most ably summed up the Evidence upon all the separate Cases, made a motion in the following words: "That an humble Address be presented to his majesty, humbly stating to his majesty, that information has been communicated to this House, and evidence produced to support it, of various corrupt practices and other abuses having prevailed for some years past, in the disposal of Commissions and Promotions in his majesty's Land Forces—that his majesty's faithful commons, according to the duty by which they are bound to his majesty and to their constituents, have carefully examined into the truth of sundry transactions which have been brought before them, in proof of such corrupt practices and abuses; and that it is with the utmost concern and astonishment his majesty's faithful commons find themselves obliged, most humbly, to inform his majesty, that the result of their diligent inquiries into the facts, by the examination of persons concerned, together with other witnesses, and a variety of documents, has been such as to satisfy his faithful commons, that the existence of such corrupt practices and abuses is substantially true.—That his Majesty's faithful commons are restrained by motives of personal respect and attachment to his majesty, from entering into a detail of these transactions, being convinced that they could not be stated without exciting the most painful sensations of grief and indignation in the breast of his majesty: That the proceedings of his majesty's faithful commons upon this important subject have been public, and the evidence brought before them is recorded in the proceedings of parliament; and

"that they trust his majesty will give them credit, when they assure his majesty, that in the execution of this painful duty they have proceeded with all due deliberation. That without entering into any other of the many obvious consequences which may be expected to follow, from the belief once generally established, of the prevalence of such abuses in the Military Department, there is one great and essential consideration inseparable from the present subject, which they humbly beg leave, in a more particular manner, to submit to his majesty's gracious consideration, namely, that if an opinion should prevail amongst his majesty's Land Forces, that promotion may be obtained by other means than by merit and service—by means at once unjust to the Army and disgraceful to the authority placed over it, the effect of such an opinion must necessarily be, to wound the feelings and abate the zeal of all ranks and descriptions of his majesty's Army.—That it is the opinion of this House, that the abuses which they have thus most humbly represented to his majesty, could not have prevailed to the extent in which they had been proved to exist, without the knowledge of the Commander in Chief; and that even if, upon any principle of reason or probability, it could be presumed that abuses so various and so long continued could, in fact have prevailed without his knowledge, such a presumption in his favour would not warrant the conclusion that the command of the Army could, with safety, or ought in prudence, to be continued in his hands.—That on these grounds and principles his majesty's faithful commons most humbly submit their opinion to his majesty's gracious consideration, that his royal highness the Duke of York ought to be deprived of the Command of the Army."

MR. PERCEVAL, with the intervention only of MR. BURTON, followed Mr. Wardle, and proposed, in the way of amendment, to leave out the whole of Mr. Wardle's motion, with the exception of the word "That," and to substitute the following in its stead:—"That an Address be presented to his majesty, humbly representing, that in consequence of charges against his royal highness the Duke of York, his faithful commons thought it their indispensable duty to inquire into the same, in the most solemn and public manner; and after the most diligent and attentive inquiry, his most faithful commons, considering the lively interest his majesty must

“feel in any inquiry respecting the conduct
 “of his royal highness the Duke of York,
 “thought it their duty to lay before his
 “majesty the following Resolutions:—
 “*Resolved*, That Charges having been
 “brought against his royal highness the
 “Duke of York, imputing to him *personal*
 “*corruption* and criminal connivance in the
 “execution of his office; and this House
 “having referred the said charges to a
 “Committee, &c. feels it its duty to pro-
 “nounce a distinct opinion upon the subject.
 “—*Resolved*, That it is the opinion of this
 “House, after the fullest and most atten-
 “tive examination of all the evidence ad-
 “duced, that there is *no ground for charg-*
 “*ing his Royal Highness with personal cor-*
 “*ruption or connivance* at such practices,
 “disclosed in the testimony heard at the
 “bar.—And his majesty’s faithful com-
 “mons think it their duty further to state
 “to his majesty, that while the House has
 “seen the *exemplary regularity* and method
 “in which business is conducted in his
 “Royal Highness’s office, and the salutary
 “regulations introduced by him, some of
 “which were intended to prevent the
 “very abuses complained of, and which
 “have been brought under review, they
 “cannot but feel the greatest regret and
 “concern that a connection should have ex-
 “isted which has thus exposed his Royal High-
 “ness’s character to public CALUMNY, and
 “that frauds should have been carried on,
 “with which his Royal Highness’s name
 “has been coupled, of a most disgraceful
 “and dangerous tendency; but it is, at the
 “same time, a great consolation to the House
 “to observe the deep concern his Royal
 “Highness has expressed, that such a
 “connection should ever have taken
 “place; and on the expression of that
 “regret the House is confident that his
 “Royal Highness will keep in view the
 “uniformly virtuous and exemplary con-
 “duct of his majesty, since the commence-
 “ment of his reign, and which has en-
 “deared his majesty to all his subjects.”

On the 10th (Friday), after Messrs.
 Bragge and Whitbread and the Attorney
 General had spoken, Mr. BANKES spoke,
 and concluded with saying, “that he was
 decidedly of opinion, that the House would
 not do its duty, if it did not communicate
 to the king their opinion, that the Duke
 of York could no longer continue an useful
 servant of the public. The Address proposed
 by Mr. Perceval, was, he observed, a mere
 extract from a Letter recently presented to
 that House, in a very extraordinary, and,
 in his mind, in a very exceptionable man-

ner. It was the custom to say, that the
 Address of the House to any Speech from
 the throne, was generally the echo of the
 Speech; but he never could suppose it
 possible to be said, that the Address of that
 House should be the echo of a letter. In
 this case, however, it might be said with
 justice; and he never could persuade him-
 self to subscribe to such an echo. He
 hoped the House would manifest an equal
 unwillingness to do so. If the House
 could not only endure to receive a letter,
 which was itself an infringement on its pri-
 vileges, but could submit to send an Address
 to his Majesty, in obedience to that letter,
 it must be contented to sink in its own
 estimation and that of the country. Let
 the proceeding of the House be guided by
 proper motives, and spring from a pure
 source, and the country would do justice
 to its conduct, while it must retain its own
 good opinion. Differing so decidedly as
 he did from his right hon. friend, in the
 conclusions to which his mind had come
 upon the evidence, he could admit nothing
 more than that it was barely possible his
 right hon. friend might be right. But
 that he was not so, that House would, he
 hoped, and trusted, for its own credit and
 character, prove by the decision it pro-
 nounced upon this important question.”—
 Mr. Bankes then proposed a further Amend-
 ment, in the following words: “That in-
 “formation had been laid before the House,
 “with respect to certain abuses and cor-
 “ruptions which were alledged to be pre-
 “valent in the disposal and purchase of
 “commissions and promotions in his ma-
 “jesty’s land forces. That the House had
 “accordingly instituted the most diligent
 “examination into the grounds of such
 “charges; and that they felt the deepest
 “concern that the result of that inquiry
 “was such as to convince them that such
 “corruptions and abuses had prevailed. That
 “they had, at the same time, great satis-
 “faction in being enabled to declare, that
 “there appeared to them to be no ground
 “for charging the Commander in Chief
 “with *personal corruption*; but while they
 “were glad to do this justice to his Royal
 “Highness, and to acknowledge the good
 “consequences that had resulted to the
 “army from the regulations he had intro-
 “duced, and the improvements he had
 “adopted in advancing their discipline
 “and conduct, still they felt themselves
 “obliged to express their opinion, that
 “such abuses could not have prevailed, to
 “the extent they had done, without exciting
 “at least the suspicion of the Commander in

"Chief; and that if such abuses had existed without the knowledge of his Royal Highness, that House *had great reason to doubt whether the chief command of his majesty's forces could with propriety, or ought with prudence, remain in the hands of the Duke of York.* That the House had discovered, with the deepest concern, that a connection had subsisted fraught with injurious consequences to the cause of religion and morals, and of a character the most opposite in its nature to the bright example of morality given, throughout a long reign, by his majesty to his people."

Of these three propositions we will first notice that of Mr. Perceval, which is, as Mr. Bankes described it, the mere *echo of a letter*, but with the addition of a declaration, that the Duke of York has been found free from *personal corruption* and from any *connivance* at such corruption.—There is nothing better calculated to bewilder and mislead the public, than an artful *selection of terms*. If the people had put to them this question: "*Do you think that it is proved, that the Duke of York knew that his mistress took money for using her influence with him, regarding promotions, &c. and that he used his authority to further her views in getting such money?*" If this question were put to the people, they would know how to answer at once, without a moment's hesitation; but, by the invention of the term "*personal corruption*," to which vast importance is attached, some people are puzzled; a distinction is erected; a doubt is excited, whether there be not one sort of corruption which is criminal, in the eye of the law, and another *not* criminal in the eye of the law.—But, what is *corruption*? The plain meaning of the word, as applied to persons in authority under the public, is this: the doing of any thing, in his public capacity, for money or money's worth, or for a private consideration of any sort; or the procuring of any thing, from such consideration, unlawfully given, to be done by another person. The minister who should give a place, or a pension, to the son of a rascal (if any such rascal could be supposed to exist, and if any minister could be found to be so base), who, in consideration thereof, should vote for him, would be guilty of corruption, as well as the wretch who should, in that manner, sell his country and his soul; and the corruption would not be the less real because neither of the parties fingered any money, on account of the infamous contract.—Well, then, what is meant

by "*personal corruption*;" why this, that the party must actually *touch the cash*, give or take the money himself; that it must go from him, or *come into his pocket*, literally into his pocket. But, reader, is there any thing solid in this distinction? Is there any thing in it, which reason says ought to have any weight in a decision upon a subject like that before us? If I stand by and see my neighbour robbed, and say nothing at all about the matter, am I not as criminal as the robber? How much *more* criminal must I be, then, if the goods stolen be applied to my use, and if I, by any means that I possess, enable the robber to commit the act, and encourage him to do it, especially if the party robbed be my employer? I do not, observe, state this as a case parallel with that of the Duke of York, upon whose *guilt or innocence* I have left, and shall leave, my readers to judge; but, I state it as a general proposition, in the way of illustration of my argument; and, I think, it will leave no doubt at all in the mind of the reader, that corruption may be as base, nay, a great deal *more* base, when the party does not actually *touch the money*, than when he does; and, it will readily occur to every man of reflection, that what is called "*personal corruption*," by which is meant, I suppose, the plain downright direct *giving and taking of bribes*, is, as to its dangerous extent, nothing at all, when compared to corruption of a more round-about and covert nature.—The truth is, that it is this latter sort of corruption, which is really dangerous to a state; and this is the sort of corruption which now is eating away the heart of this country. Sir FRANCIS BURDETT, in his most admirable speech of the 13th instant, speaking of the Case of KENNETT, said, that, from the evidence given in this case, "*it appeared that the Duke of York was actuated by a greedy desire of getting money almost by any means, and accordingly undertook to recommend a fraudulent bankrupt to an office under government for the sake of a loan.*" Here he could not help saying a few words on the subject of corruption. The "*right hon. gent. (Mr. Perceval)* seemed to consider corruption as synonymous with the *actual taking of money for improper purposes*; and, with this idea in his mind, he said that corruption was not so prevalent in our days as in former times. He thought the golden age was returned; and that, with respect to corruption, our days might be consider-

“ed as a ‘Paradise regained.’ What did
 “the hon. gent. think of the multitudes of
 “offices at the disposal of ministers and
 “their underlings; the colonial places;
 “the situations created by the increase of
 “the various establishments in the coun-
 “try, and the immense amount of the
 “taxes? Of the taxes which had risen to
 “such a height, that men looked up to
 “government in order to get back a part
 “of their own. By the reduction of their
 “incomes, men were first driven to men-
 “dicity, *and then bribed with their own*
 “*money.* True, these were not times when
 “a member of parliament could take a
 “bribe of £.500 in the lobby, nor when
 “he dined with the Speaker could he ex-
 “pect to find a sum of money under the
 “cover of his plate. We saw little in
 “our times of the open and barefaced
 “corruption of ruder ages. Corruption
 “was now gilded with the name of Office,
 “which was greedily snatched at by him
 “who, as the right hon. gent. had ob-
 “served, would be ashamed to take the
 “value of ready money into his hand.
 “The Duke of York certainly did not,
 “when acting corruptly, *take so many gui-*
 “*neas in hand.* This was too gross for the
 “times, especially when corruption could
 “be so easily gilded. Corruption had
 “*no necessary connection with money*—cor-
 “ruption consisted in the corrupt motive,
 “in swaying the mind from truth and jus-
 “tice. The Chancellor of the Exchequer,
 “therefore, might say, that there was less
 “of open bribery in our days than in former
 “times—but he seemed entirely to mis-
 “conceive the meaning of the term, when
 “he said there was less corruption.”

A bribe in hard cash upon the nail is not
 half so dangerous as a bribe in the way of
 office; the former is a transaction which
 has a speedy end, the latter binds the cor-
 rupted party for life, or for a considerable
 time, in all human probability.—Mrs.
 Clarke told the House, with her usual
 frankness, that she was desired to ask some
 of the persons, whom she patronized, to
get members of parliament to vote thus and
 thus, upon certain occasions; and she
 mentions one particular instance, wherein
 the Duke of York told her, that he had in-
 formed Mr. Long of her success in this
 way, who was much pleased at it. This
 passed, at first, for one of her sallies;
 nobody believed, or, at least, nobody, in
 the House, appeared to believe her; but,
 by-and-by, out comes a bundle of her
 sprightly and careless notes, which were
 in the hands of Sandon, and which the

lawyers had, with their usual judgment, of
 themselves, of their own seeking, brought
 forth; and, in these notes, she is found to
 talk as familiarly of *getting votes for Pitt*,
 as one talks of getting a hare or a brace
 of birds for a friend. In one of these
 notes, she says to Sandon: “Will you,
 “my good Sir, drop me a line on Monday
 “morning, saying if *you* have been able
 “to influence any person who is with Pitt,
 “to attend the House on Monday and give
 “his *Vote.*” The word *vote* is in italics.
 She knew what was the thing wanted.—
 In another note, to the same person, she
 says: “Do you think it possible to *get me*
 “*a Vote* on Monday for Pitt’s motion? It
 “will, if carried, be of some consequence
 “to *us* hereafter; try all you can.—
 Now, are we to believe, that Mrs. Clarke
 would have written thus, if there had been
 no such thing as “getting votes” going
 on? Or, are we to believe, that this is a
 mere specimen, accidentally come to light;
 forced out, as it were while the Devil was
 asleep, by the lawyers themselves, to
 prove to the world, the existence of a ge-
 nerally pervading system of corruption?
 —I leave these questions to the reader,
 and beseech him, while yet there is time,
 to think of the remedy.—The money
 taken by Mrs. Clarke, and by others un-
 der her auspices, for promotions and the
 like, ought by no means to be considered
 as applied to *her* or to *their* use. The Duke
 kept her not for *her* pleasure, or for any
 purpose of *hers*; but solely for *his* plea-
 sure and for *his* purposes. Therefore,
 whatever he gave her, he gave from a
 selfish motive; and, whatever she obtain-
 ed, no matter in what manner, *in conse-*
quence of her connection with him, arose from
 the gratification of his selfish feelings and
 pleasures. If I were, therefore, to leave
 out of sight all the evidence relating to
his knowledge, that she trafficked in com-
 missions, and that the net proceeds went
 towards the support of her establishment;
 if I were to blast, in a lump, all the evi-
 dence of *Mrs. Clarke, Miss Taylor, the two*
Letters, and the Note, with all the scores of
 corroborations verbal and written; still I
 should say, that it was owing to the ex-
 istence of the connection; that it was
 owing to the establishment in Gloucester
 Place; that it was owing to the adulterous
 intercourse; that, in short, it was for the
 gratification of the Duke of York’s lust,
 and for that purpose solely, that all the in-
 famous acts, which have come to light,
 were committed.—As to the other parts
 of Mr. Perceval’s proposition, I will not

stop to notice them. They are, as Mr. Bankes well observed, a mere echo of the Duke's Letter to the House. Any thing much more adulatory was never tendered to any of the Tudors.

MR. WARDLE's proposition does, in my opinion, either not go far enough, or it goes too far. It is true, as lord Folkestone observed, that the Charge upon the Journals does not contain an allegation of personal corruption, or of *corruption* of any sort or degree; but, I think, the Address should have contained an explicit opinion upon *that point*; or, that it should have contained *no opinion at all*. If the person accused had been any other than a near relation of the king, I should have been decidedly for a decision upon that point; but, he being a son of the king, I should have been for merely *laying the evidence before the king*; for, as to "*throwing the odium*" upon the king, by such a step, what do those mean, who talk of that? The "*odium*" of *what* do they talk of? The *odium* of dismissing his son from his office? The *odium* of doing that of *himself*, whatever it may be, which the House of Commons will, or would, advise him to do? The inquiry has taken place; the whole of the evidence is before the public; the people understand the whole matter. Every man in the kingdom understands it as well as it is possible for him to understand it. The king has the same means of judging laid before him. And, why should it be called "*throwing the odium upon him*," to leave the decision to his sole breast? In short, to give any rational interpretation of these words, you must suppose, you must conclude before hand, that the king's decision would be *unjust*, or, at least, that *so it would appear to the nation*; and that, therefore, it is, for the sake of the king, necessary to keep from him the office of deciding. And here again is a dilemma; for, if you talk of "*odium*," as the Nabob's Gazette does, it must fall *somewhere*; and, where will it fall? where can it fall? Indeed, it is nonsense to talk of the odium attached to the decision, unless you pre-suppose, *that the decision will be unjust*, to justify which supposition I shall leave as a pleasing task for the trading, the regular trading, Anti-Jacobins, in town and country.—For these reasons, I would have simply moved to submit the evidence to the king, without being at all afraid, that his decision would have exposed him to public reproach. But, at any rate, if I had not done that, I would have brought before the House the direct question as to the *corruption*. There was,

in my opinion, no medium to be adopted, consistent with the ends of justice, or with the character of the House.—If the latter had been rejected, and such a motion as that of Mr. Bankes, which is only one degree removed from that of Mr. Perceval, had been adopted, the original motion would have only shared the fate, which, in all probability, Mr. Wardle's motion will now share; while he would have avoided the possibility of an imputation of having shrunk from the question. I am convinced, that he was actuated solely by the motive of sparing the feelings of the king, and this, indeed, is, by lord Folkestone, stated to have been his motive; but, experience will teach Mr. Wardle, that, however well *forbearance* may be calculated to operate on the mind of the king, and there to produce a reciprocity of feeling, forbearance is not the way to obtain the concurrence of *his servants*, in the House of Commons, who are sure to advance upon you two steps for every one that you recoil. If Mr. Wardle was convinced, that the Duke of York had, knowingly, participated in the profits of the corruption, carried on under his name, he should have made that a distinct question; and, having brought the House to decide that, *yea*, or *no*, he might, then, very consistently, have supported the next best proposition that should have been made, leaving the country to judge for itself between him and those who opposed him. This, or what I should still have, in this case, preferred, simply laying the evidence before the king, was, in my humble opinion, the path to pursue.

With regard to Mr. Bankes's proposition, much need not be said. It has, though not quite so much of adulation as the proposition of Mr. Perceval, a great deal of the smooth and the sweet in it. It is a mixture of oil and vinegar and molasses; it is a compound certainly, but the pleasant ingredients are not only two to one in number, they predominate also in the quantity of each. There is, indeed, an expression relative to the *dismissal of the Duke*, which, by-the-bye, appears, after all, to be *the thing most dreaded by his friends*, and against which all their efforts have been bent; but, this expression has in it so little of the positive, that, to disregard it could not well be looked upon, by those who use the expression, as a subject of very serious complaint. To me, I will frankly confess, that the dismissal of the Duke appears to be an object of no very great importance. In fact, and to speak

out plain, I do not care a straw about the matter, unless the dismissal were accompanied with measures, which should *effectually* prevent similar corruptions in future; and, as no such measure appears to be in agitation, I think it of no consequence whatever to the nation, whether the Duke be dismissed or whether he remain.

I cannot, however, agree in the opinion, now expressed by Mr. Bankes, and before expressed by several of the ministers, or their friends, "that this Inquiry will do *no good*." On the contrary, I think, and I am convinced, that it already *has done* a great deal of good; and that it will continue, with other things, "to work together for good," until the day of perfect purification shall arrive; until the whole of the system of corruption shall be rooted out; until *all* the vermin, who prey and who fatten upon the vitals of the nation, shall have been caught and made to regorge; and until the throne as well as the people shall have been secured from the consequences of their wide-spreading depredations. What! has this inquiry done "no good?" This inquiry, which has *discovered* to the East India Directors such an extensive traffic in *their* offices; and, since the commencement of which by Mr. Wardle, Mr. Perceval has set to work to prosecute the regular traders in offices and *livings*? Good-God! not done any *good*?—While, however, this is contended for, on the one hand, in order to lessen, or to deny altogether, the merit of Mr. Wardle, it is as strenuously contended, on the other hand, that the Inquiry will do a wonderful deal of good, as to the future conduct of the Duke of York. The Attorney General, on the 9th of the month, after stating, that he was for a decision that should fall short of making his royal highness retire, or be removed, concluded thus:—"Could any man, after this Inquiry, believe that things would grow worse? Did any man believe that the Duke of York was insensible to the perils and dangers with which he was surrounded, and that he would not *profit by the lesson he had received*? Did any man think he would not be sensible of his acquittal, and of *the reproof accompanying it*? Did any man believe that he would not be sensible of all these things, and *careful to avoid a similar situation*?"—Well, then, whatever may be *our* opinion upon these points; whatever we may think of the disposition of the Duke, taking into view his letter to the House, and not forgetting the company he has been *proved*

to delight in; whatever may be *our* opinion, *your* opinion is, that he will "*profit from this lesson*;" that he will be sensible of "*the reproof*," which, it appears that even you would now give him; and, that he will be in future, "*careful to avoid such a situation*." Indeed! But, *to whom*, then, will he be indebted for this profitable lesson? Whom will he have to thank for this affecting reproof? Not you, nor any of those, who are to be numbered amongst his defenders and friends. No, for you, from the first, flattered him with complete acquittal; you scouted the charges against him; and, one of you, in the apparent confident reliance that those charges could not be supported; that the means would be found of hooting them down, asserted, that *infamy* would alight somewhere, upon the *accuser* or the *accused*. No, it is not by you, or any of you, or all of you together, that this great good, as you appear to esteem it, would have been done; but, by Mr. Wardle, and solely by Mr. Wardle; it is he (supposing your proposition to take effect) that will have produced all the good, which you anticipate from it; it is he, and he alone, that will have produced the *lesson* and the *reproof*. Let it be repeated by nobody, then, and particularly by you, that this inquiry has *done no good*, and that the author of it is not entitled to the highest marks of honour that the people can bestow upon him.

Upon the quality of the evidence, or any part of it, I shall not here offer any remark; but, there are two or three *presumptions*, which have been set up by the defenders of the Duke of York, and which I think it proper to point out to the attention of my readers; first observing, what, I dare say, they will all have observed before, that, though it is common enough for a judge to set aside presumptions when opposed to positive testimony, there never was a judge, an English judge, at least, who ventured to set aside positive testimony upon the ground of opposing presumptions.—The first of these presumptions is, that the Duke would not have given into these transactions for the sake of so paltry sum as £.2,500, which, it is *asserted*, was all that Mrs. Clarke gained and brought into the firm at Gloucester Place, by the corruptions in which she had a hand. But, as to the sum, is it not more likely to have been £.50,000 than £.2,500? Look at her Letters to Sandon; hear the evidence of Sandon and Donovan and Hovenden and Cowrie and others, and you find

the tra
tinually
transac
explai
that sh
that co
that t
more t
Lord
made
all the
mirers
same t
nion,
gance,
establ
But, l
the fa
presum
paltry
find h
year,
to wh
but a
which
the co
not be
her r
fore u
small
as an
tain
gone
have
farthe
at, th
asked
to mo
of the
A ve
answ
that
to wh
carrie
the w
much
of ob
denc
Mrs.
But,
has
has
not c
depe
anot
tive
spoo
sum
upon
your
Why

the trade of jobs and loans and bills continually going on. You hear of many transactions, which have not been at all explained. She forgets scores of people that she has had dealings with. After all that could be done, it remained unproved, that the Duke paid to Gloucester Place more than from 12 to 15 hundred a year. Lord Folkestone, in a speech which he made on the 10th, and which makes good all the expectations of his greatest admirers, has said, that he kept house at the same time, and that he is clearly of opinion, that he, *without any waste or extravagance*, could not have maintained such an establishment for £.10,000 a year.—

But, be the sum what it might, why, in the face of positive testimony, are we to *presume*, that the Duke would not, for a paltry sum, do what was wrong, when we find him, for the paltry sum of £.400 a year, breaking his promise, to the woman to whom he had written the *two letters*, but a few months before, the existence of which promise Mr. Adam has proved, and the *condition* upon which it was made, has not been proved to have been broken by her? After this proof has been laid before us, *why* are we to *presume*, that the *smallness* of any sum should be considered as an objection to his using means to obtain or withhold it.—If the Duke had gone as far as the evidence states him to have gone, it is said, *why had he not gone farther?* If he participated in, or connived at, the sale of some commissions, we are asked, why he did not do so with respect to more? Why did he not raise hundreds of thousands of pounds in this way?—

A very good answer might be given; an answer quite sufficient for such a question, that we do not, and, as yet, cannot, know to what extent the traffic may have been carried; for, as Mr. WHITBREAD observed, the wonder is, not that *so little*, but that *so much*, has come to light, through that mass of obstructions, which every word of evidence against him, except the evidence of Mrs. Clarke, has had to work its way.—

But, is not this the first time, that it ever has been attempted to prove, that a man has not done one thing, because he has not done another, the two being in no wise dependent upon, or connected with one another? Were your servant, upon positive testimony, accused of stealing your spoons, should you expect to hear a presumption urged against the testimony, upon the ground of his not having stolen your mugs and the rest of your plate? Why, if such presumptions were, in the

usual course of justice, admitted to have weight, no man would be hanged for sheep-stealing, till he had got half the flock. Poor sheep! - They would, under such law, stand but a bad chance in a hard winter.—The Crown Lawyers have, in this case, as in many others, completely inverted the usual and settled course of arguing. That course is, to presume, that, when a man has *one* fact proved against him, there are *others* behind, which are not proved. Mr. Whitbread very finely observed here, that it was, with common culprits, always “the first time;” but, the Crown Lawyers, in place of arguing thus, would have us believe, that, *because* there have been only *four instances*, relating to which positive testimony respecting corruption has been produced, while there has been 15 or 16 thousand promotions in the army, there has been *no corruption at all*. To continue my old illustration of the sheep-stealers, what would a Judge, sitting at Dorchester, say, if a lawyer were to argue, that because the testimony against his client related to only four sheep, stolen from a down where there were fifty thousand feeding every night, it therefore was to be presumed that he had stolen *none at all*? What would the Judge say? Why, he would say nothing; he would smile, and be looking over his notes; and, in his charge to the jury, would certainly think it unnecessary to allude to such an argument.

The second presumption that I shall notice is this: that the Duke, when informed of the charges, expressed his desire that the Inquiry should be *public*; that he would not have done this, and that he would not have before *set Mrs. Clarke at defiance*, unless he had been conscious of innocence.—As to the *mode of inquiry*, the choice was certainly a bad one; it was not favourable to him; but, it gave him much of support, which he could not have had elsewhere; much of legal and oratorical talent; and he had had opportunities of witnessing the result of such inquiries, as in the case of the ill-fated Mr. Paull against Mr. Sheridan. He was acquainted with the person of Mrs. Clarke, but he might be no judge of her *character*, or of how she would act in such a perilous case; a case so perilous, that lord Folkestone tells us, that rumours of *expulsion* were, at one time, afloat with respect to Mr. Wardle himself.—As to the setting of Mrs. Clarke at defiance, he had so long been in the enjoyment of so much power; he must have presumed that nothing was

to be done without the testimony of *officers in the army*; he could not reasonably have supposed, that she would be assisted so ably by the Lawyers; how was he to imagine, that they would *goad* her on to go and hunt out his letters, absolutely goad her till she did it; that Mr. Lowten, his own attorney, would be set to work to force Nicholls to bring a whole package of proofs in support of her, which she had ordered to be burnt; that accident had placed in her careless hands, and what is more, kept there, the letter of the Archbishop of Tuam; and that, at last, as it were for a *grand coup de théâtre*, just before the curtain dropped, his friends, with the manifest expectation of proving a forgery upon her, should force from Sandon, should draw from him, as if it had been the last drop of his heart's blood, that NOTE, which, of all things in the whole world, she must have wished to see produced against him, and, at the sight of which, according to the description of Mr. Whitbread, her eyes might well beam with joy?—How was the Duke to have expected all, or any part of this? Nobody could expect it. Mr. Wardle; nay, Mrs. Clarke herself, could not possibly have expected any such thing; and, does not the reader clearly perceive, that, if there had been none of these unexpected discoveries, her evidence, that very evidence which these discoveries have so fully corroborated, would have been set down as a tissue of falsehoods?—How long would her word have stood against Claverings's, if Mr. Lowten had not kindly forced Nicholls to bring the General's own letters, to give the lie direct to what he had said with a view of blasting the credit of her, who had so long and so disinterestedly been his benefactress?—Besides, it was, after Mr. Wardle brought forward his charges, a little too late to attempt to silence Mrs. Clarke. Any overture to her, at this period, for that purpose, ran the manifest risk of failing; and, if it failed, there was the proof of guilt at once. It was too late to recoil, though it was not too late to forbear *goad*ing her on to search for proofs of her veracity.—When a man is asked: "Is such a thing *true*, that they say of you," he is very apt to say *no*, if he sees that *yes* would be injurious to him; and, when he *has* said *no*, it is not very easy to say *yes* to the same question. It is an old saying, that "one lie makes many." When once a man gets into falsehood, he generally goes on. It is so difficult to retrace his steps; indeed it is impossible, without

confessing that he has told a falsehood; and this is what few men are found able to bring their minds to. When they make the first denial, they do not see all, nor scarcely any part of the consequences, which are likely to follow; and hence it is, that we invariably see the guilty contribute, in this way, towards their own conviction and condemnation.—There appears, therefore, to be nothing solid in this presumption, founded on the Duke's setting Mrs. Clarke at defiance.

The third *presumption* is of a nature still more strange than either of the others. It is this: that, if the Duke had had any knowledge of these corruptions, it is not to be believed, that he would, in so solemn a manner, have denied the fact.—This is, in the tone of the Duke's famous Letter, setting "the honour of a prince" in opposition to the evidence taken at the bar, and giving it the preference to all that body of evidence; and, as I observed before, in speaking of that letter, the short way of going to work, if this reasoning be allowed, would have been, to shew Mr. Wardle's charges to the Duke, and to pronounce an acquittal immediately upon his simple declaration that the charges were false. We are asked, with great emphasis: "Can any man believe, that a prince of the illustrious House of Brunswick would have denied these allegations, in so solemn a manner, if he had not been certain of their falsehood?"—Yes: many men, and I am one of the number. I can believe it, and thoroughly believe it too; and, my reasons for so believing are these. 1. Because the allegations are supported by a great body of evidence *as good* and *much fuller* than what the law requires for the taking away the life of a common malefactor; 2. Because it has been stated by Mr. Adam, that the Duke of York declared to him, that he *never* corresponded with Mrs. Clarke upon military matters, while, by a letter in the Duke's own hand-writing, it is proved, that he did correspond with her on military matters; and 3. Because Mr. Adam has stated, that the Duke of York declared, that he never wrote to Mrs. Clarke the note touching Tonyn's promotion; while, by indubitable testimony, it is proved, that the note extracted from Sandon, was in the Duke's hand-writing, which note was sent to Mrs. Clarke, and which note related to Tonyn's promotion.—For these reasons, if there were no other, I should scout such a presumption as the one above described; which presumption, indeed, if it were, for

one m
would
most o
the v
of pe
to ran
ject S
"had
"with
"para
"ing
"exc
"cum
"nua
"that
"and
"had
"unre
"by
"for
"diti
"give
"ever
"hona
"sure
"the
"the
"star
"no
"nou
"was
"clue
"fain
"a f
"bef
upon
press
speed
heard
"has
"ter
"tre
"did
"tua
"hav
"pri
"we
"wh
"wi
"an
"ful
"wi
"tha
"no
"I n
"th
"tha
"be s
"to th
"wha
"whi

one moment, admitted to have any weight, would go to establish a precedent the most dangerous in the world, namely, that the words, and, of course, the *evidence* of persons are to be estimated according to *rank, birth, or wealth*. Upon this subject Sir Francis Burdett asked: "What had been the Duke of York's conduct with regard to Mrs. Clarke? He separated from her, not certainly for having taken money for commissions: His excessive love for her was the only circumstance that could at all have extenuated his offence, and yet it appeared that she was shaken off like an old shoe, and threatened with *infamy*. This she had asserted; and her testimony stood unrebuted, although the means existed by calling the messenger. She begged for money to pay her debts, and on condition of receiving this she had offered to give up the claim to her annuity; but even this was refused. Where was *the honour of a Prince* then? This was, surely, no great settlement, considering the terms on which she had lived with the Duke of York, and all the circumstances. He said "you have no bond, no legal demand," and there was *the honour of a Prince*." If this was honour, it was a sort of honour which scarcely included the ingredients of honesty and fair dealing, and which could not weigh a feather in opposition to the evidence before the House."—Mr. Whitbread, upon the same subject, was still more impressive; and, indeed, the whole of his speech was one of the best that ever was heard from any man. "Why," said he, "has the Duke of York written such a letter to the House? I speak not now of its trenching upon our privileges; but, why did he reduce us to the melancholy situation of believing the evidence we have heard, even against *the honour of a prince*?" The honour of a prince! Alas! we must all come to that fatal period, when death, which knows no distinction, will class the prince with the peasant; and yet, if we turn our eyes to that awful spectacle, shall we not find the wretch, with a rope about his neck, protesting that innocence which he knows he is not possessed of? *Protestations*, then, "I never will heed: in this case I hear of them with horror."—Of that Letter, that intolerable Letter, enough will be to be said hereafter; but, in what it relates to the subject before us, it must be asked, what the Duke means by the *distinction*, which his words clearly convey. Does

he mean that the honour of a prince is of *superior quality* to that of a man in private life, and entitled to the same degree of precedence, as he himself would be in a public procession? If he would impress us with an idea, that his honour is of quality superior to that of an earl, or a gentleman, we must ask him where it was, what was its influence, when his declarations were made to Mr. Adam, relative to the not corresponding upon military matters, and to the writing of the note about Tonyn; that note; that note, which was thought to be destroyed, and which, good God! Mr. Perceval, in his speech, presumed to be a *forgery* by Mrs. Clarke; a crime, affecting the life of the woman, to whom the Duke had vowed everlasting love?

I have noticed these presumptions a little more fully (though not so well, perhaps) than I find them noticed in the reports of the speeches, not because there was any danger of their producing effect upon the public mind; but because they are all, absolutely *all* that has, by the combined ingenuity of so many ingenious men, been found out to weigh against the evidence taken at the bar. Upon that evidence the public is well able to judge; and I have now laid before my readers all that I can discover, which has, *taking it as a whole*, been opposed to it. As to the nature of the evidence, and the characters and credibility of the witnesses, the public is in possession of all the means of judging; and, when they have attended to the *presumptions*, above noticed, they see all, eye all, that has been opposed to the great mass of evidence taken at the bar.

To those, who have read the speeches of Lord Folkestone and Sir Francis Burdett, not a word need be said upon the treatment which Mr. Wardle and his witnesses have received, nor upon the general and uniform conduct, through the whole of this affair, of the *king's servants* in the House of Commons. Indeed, no man of common observation could stand in need of the remarks made, as to these matters, in those speeches; and, if there be any part of the conduct of Mr. Wardle, at which I feel regret, it is his having stated, that he had received indulgence and assistance at the hands of the ministers and their friends; in which statement, if meant ironically, the irony is imperceptible to common discernment; and, if not so, does not well square with that character of *sincerity* and *plain dealing*, which has distinguished Mr. Wardle from the outset, which, at once, gained him the hearts of

the country, and which, in fact, it was that carried him safely through all the perils, with which he was encompassed. *Complimenting*, I never knew succeed in gaining over, or in softening, any ministry; while I never knew it fail to weaken more or less, the confidence of the people. It is so much in the style, in the common cant, of professed feed advocates, that it never fails to excite some degree of suspicion as to the sincerity of those who use it. There is, honest nature tells every living soul, a fit antipathy of *right to wrong*; and, if we would be not only right, but thought to be so in sincerity and in earnestness, we must take care that the fashion of the times does not lead us into that sort of refinement, which must excite a doubt as to the existence of such antipathy. There is, on this account, a great draw-back from the excellence of Mr. Whitbread's speech, who sets out with almost fulsome compliments on that of Mr. Perceval, which he praises for qualities, not only which, it is evident, he perceives it did not possess, but of which he is prepared to shew, and of which he actually does shew, that it is completely destitute. This may, for aught I know, be refinement; it may suit the manners of the times; but, I shall, I hope, always continue to look upon such refinement as but a very bad exchange for simplicity and sincerity; and I am sure, that such refinement, though it may be considered ornamental in an orator, and may tend to smooth his intercourse in life, will never be compatible with earnest and efficient efforts to rescue the nation from the effects of corruption, which is a monster not to be dealt with courteously, not to be even smiled upon without the danger of contamination, or, at least, of suspicion of such contamination. There is no occasion for brutal manners, or rough language; and Mr. Wardle has gained much by his mildness and good-nature; but, these may exist in the highest possible degree, without any of that over-strained civility, that refinement, which is at war with sincerity, and, indeed, which is at war with *truth*. It is this very refinement, this fashionable refinement, this prevalent desire to keep smooth the intercourse in high life; it is this, and this alone, that has prevented these and similar corruptions from being blazoned forth long ago. There have not been wanting men, and men enough, of talents more than sufficient, and of integrity too, who have seen these things, and who have felt indignant at their existence; but, they

have wanted courage, that sort of courage which is much more rare than the courage necessary to mount a breach bristled with bayonets, namely, the courage to overcome solicitations, to encounter the frowns of all the fashionable host, and to see the world of your acquaintance turn their backs upon you. This sort of courage Mr. Wardle has been found to possess, and I trust, that nothing upon earth will induce him to deviate from the plain path, in which he set out.

Much has been said, in the debate, about the "*clamour out of doors*," and about the people having been misled by "*garbled statements*."—When the popular opinion is for any measure adopted by the government; when it is in *approbation* of the conduct of the king's ministers, then it is termed the "*voice of the people*," or the "*sense of the nation*;" but, when it runs in *opposition* to their wishes, then it is "*popular clamour*." It could not fail to be observed, in the debate, in answer to this charge against the people, that those who now urge it, advised the king "to appeal to the *sense of his people*," when they came into power, under the cry of *no-popery*. Then the people had *sense*, it seems, but now their wish is mere *clamour*, though it is pretty clear, I think, that they understand this subject *full as well* as they did that, to say the least of it. Why is *this* not called an "appeal to the *sense of the people*?" One of the *advantages*, which the Duke's friends expected, and said they expected, from an examination at the bar, was *publicity*. What did they mean by *publicity*, if it was not the communication of the evidence to the people? and what *end* was that to answer, unless it was that the people should *express their opinions* upon the case? Their opinions, it would seem, from this charge of "*clamour*," are pretty distinctly expressed *against* the Duke of York; but, whose fault is that? They might have been expressed as loudly in his *favour*; and yet, in that case, I very much doubt, whether we should have heard a word about "*popular clamour*."

—As to *garbled statements*, it is, as Lord Folkestone observed, quite wonderful to see the fulness and the accuracy, with which the evidence has, from day to day, been given in the news-papers. One must actually see it to believe the thing possible; to believe it to be within the compass of human ability; nor is the fact a little creditable to the literary talents of the country. Gentlemen of the House of

Common
body and
sonable
great, th
who can
sure, an
night of
of the g
ings; v
eight o
the afte
sage, t
while;
crowde
ence fo
hand a
who an
ses, the
consta
often
from l
pering
have h
with l
what,
gentle
ration
form?
bling,
ciproc
every
the L
guilty
the o
ment,
has p
of Yo
nesse
proac
hope
No of
publi
have
the d
but,
how
that,
not
evid
not
of th
part
neve
so a
any
imp
bee
case
an a
tren
Bur

Commons now complain of *their* fatigue of body and mind. This complaint is reasonable enough; but if their fatigue is great, their fatigue, who sit at their ease; who can walk out and return at their pleasure, and who can be absent for half the night or more; what must be the fatigue of the gentlemen, who report the proceedings; who are sometimes squeezed, from eight o'clock in the morning to three in the afternoon, into a close and hot passage, there compelled to *stand* all the while; who thence remove into a not less crowded gallery; who have no convenience for writing other than a book in their hand and an ink bottle at their breast; who are obliged to attend to *all* that passes, the fingers moving, while the ear is constantly upon the stretch to catch the often inarticulate sounds that proceed from below, and amidst a buzz of whispering and noises of various sorts; and who have had to follow this, night after night, with little cessation, for six weeks past: what, I ask, must be the fatigue of these gentlemen, and how great ought our admiration to be at what they do actually perform?—But, as was observed, the garbling, if there has been any, has been reciprocal, at worst; and, I am sure, that every candid man will say, that, of all the London Daily papers, the only one guilty of flagrant and base partiality; nay, the only one which has *pronounced judgment*, has been the Morning Post, which has pronounced the *acquittal* of the Duke of York, and which has loaded *all* the witnesses against him with every term of reproach contained in our language.—I hope the reader will bear this in mind. No other paper; no other editor; no other public writer, that I know of, or that I have heard of, has attempted to anticipate the decision of the House of Commons; but, the editor of this paper has told them how they ought to decide; and, not only that, but has told them, that, if they do not *acquit* the Duke, and consider all the evidence against him as lies, *they will not do their duty*.—Yet, do the *friends* of the Duke, and they alone, complain of partial and garbled statements!—No: never were the people, upon the whole, so amply and so faithfully informed, upon any subject, within my remembrance. To impose, upon them would, indeed, have been very difficult; but, except in the case of the Morning Post, I have not seen an attempt so to do. There is, indeed, extreme *anxiety* prevailing; but, as Sir Francis Burdett observed in the closing part of his

speech, the people ask for, and *wish* for nothing but *justice*. “Many,” he said, “had been the warnings which the House “had received against *popular influence*. It “might be unparliamentary to say, that “the House could be swayed by any undue influence—but of all influence that “could possibly operate, that of the people he believed was the last to be feared. “There were indeed, other kinds of influence, which would weigh more with “ordinary men, although they could not “be supposed to have any effect on the “minds of Members of Parliament. But “the anxiety in the public mind was, “that the decision should be just. The “people of England had *always been remarkable for their love of justice*, and *justice alone* was what they required. If “their minds were divested of the opinion “of the prevalence of undue influence in “that House, the decision would readily “be received as just, whether *for or against* “the Duke of York. *If the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Gentlemen who held “places under him would walk out, and leave “the rest to decide, whatever might be “the result the people would be satisfied.*”

—This virtue, this love of justice, is so deeply rooted in the hearts of Englishmen, that nothing can extirpate it. Their enemy, be he who he may, the moment he is arraigned, loses, in their eyes, the character of enemy. If the *whole* nation could be impannelled, and had the Devil upon trial, they would, if left to themselves, use him fairly.

The plain truth is, that all this querulousness, on the part of the Duke of York's defenders, arises, not from any thorough persuasion, that there is really what might properly be called a “popular *clamour*” against him; that the people have been misled by garbled statements; but, from a feeling of uneasiness and impatience to see, that the people, upon a clear understanding of the whole of the case, are steadily fixed in opposition to their views; and that, at last, they have been roused, beyond the power of all the soporifics in the world, to a sense of the existence of a system of corruption more extensive than they could, with reason, have supposed to exist.—Yet, I think, it is as clear as the noon-day sun, that, if this nation is not to be conquered; if this government is not to be overthrown; if England is not to share the fate of Holland and Italy, as I trust she is not, she will owe her salvation to those, who have set about, and shall set about, and shall effect, the rooting out,

while there is yet time, those corruptions, and all those abominations, which, more than the armies of Napoleon, have contributed towards the fall of the old governments upon the continent of Europe. Mr. COKE of Norfolk, in his speech of the 14th, which, to obviate the charge of *garbling*, I take from the Morning Post newspaper, is reported to have said, "that, though the original Address may not be carried, yet in conscience he would say, from the evidence, *that there was corruption in the extreme, personally attached to the Duke of York*. Circumstantial evidence he built upon, and this he felt to be much stronger than positive evidence, at least it had carried more men to the gallows. Had any doubt remained on his mind in the matter, the speech of his hon. friend Mr. Whitbread would have removed it all. (*Order! order!*)—He (Mr. Coke) was determined to oppose corruption, whatever form it may assume; and its defence he would leave to those who were likely to thrive by it.—(*Order! Order!*)—If the country were to be saved, it could only be by opposing such corruption. When he looked to the situation of the hon. gentlemen on the other side, he would no longer pay any degree of attention to what they said on the subject.—(*Loud cries of order! order!*)—The hon. gent. concluded by returning his thanks to the hon. mover, Colonel Wardle."—Yes, if this country is to be saved, it must be as Mr. Coke says, by opposing corruption. The people must be brought to a conviction, that they are fairly dealt by; that the means collected from their earnings are honestly and judiciously, or, at least, honestly disposed of; and, surely, this conviction they ought to have, if it be possible to give it them, which it is, by letting them see that the parliament and the servants of the king are ready to co-operate cordially in bringing to light, and in punishing, all corrupt practices, let the guilty parties be who they may.—Mr. PLOMER (the Solicitor General) and some others, spoke of the pain, which a sentence against the Duke, must give to him and to the king. Those gentlemen are not the only persons that feel this. The people in general feel it as they ought, and every one is anxiously desirous to spare the feelings of the king. But, it is here a question of justice, and that is to be done at all events. There is nothing vindictive in the feeling of the public. All they ask is, security for themselves; and this they are convinced they can-

not have without justice being now done.

—The "*conspiracy*" has again been mentioned, but, I observe with pleasure, in a feebler tone of voice; and *jacobinism*, poor jacobinism, has fallen into such disrepute as no longer to be deemed worthy of assisting to swell out a period. Nobody will believe Mr. Coke to be a jacobin and leveller, and yet, we see, that he has a very decided opinion upon the conduct of the Duke of York. His short speech is worth many a long one; worth whole volumes of some speeches, and will tell for more throughout the kingdom. These out-cries about a *conspiracy* and *jacobinism* did, at the first, indicate no confidence of the goodness of the cause of those who made use of them. Nor did they indicate much of that which the world calls wisdom. From that moment to the close of the Inquiry, they gave us proofs of no wisdom. Wise men would not have goaded Mrs. Clarke; wise men would not have done many other things, which were done, and every one, aye, to the very last, operated against themselves. But, in fact, there is nothing that is a match for Truth, if she has only a small portion of fair play.

—In my next I shall, I doubt not, be able to record the result of this long and interesting inquiry and discussion. The public have, as I wished, fixed their attention wholly and exclusively upon it; they have thought and justly thought, that, until this question was decided, it was time wasted for them to attend to any other matters of a public nature; that, until this was decided, they knew not how to feel, what to wish for, or what to fear. The campaigns of the continent; the views of courts! what were they, what could they be, to us, until this great question at home, at our very doors, was settled? This is the light, in which the people have viewed the matter; they have, at last, fixed their eyes upon that which is to them the only interesting object; having so done, there is little fear of their being deceived in future; and, let all those who have lived upon corruption, who have thriven only because the people were blind, take warning in time.

Botley, Thursday, 16 March, 1809.

SUBSCRIPTION

FOR

MISS TAYLOR.

Botley, March 12, 1809.

In consequence of the observations, made in the last number of my Register, respecting the distressed situation of Miss

TAYLOR
which
to set
commen

The
and her
support
difficult
School,
to be
(as Mr
of Con
must
"if she
"be t
"dear
"he w
since s
where
to her
lars, t
goods
due, a
ger of
about
the ut

Now
taxes
Inquir
was f
must
ficulti
that it
once,
the st
schola
payin
vency
all he
this y
we co
ly co
virtue
ment
been
sery
not b
the a
havin
in a
necti

Of
niary
hand
ques
in an
than
ral;
her
cons
ellor

TAYLOR, I have this day received letters, which have determined me to endeavour to set on foot the Subscription there recommended.

The Statement of her Case is this: She and her Sister (not having parents able to support them) set about, and, after great difficulty, had succeeded in establishing a School, at Chelsea, by which they hoped to be able to support themselves; that (as Mr. WARDLE has declared in the House of Commons), when he told her that he must have her Evidence, she said, that "if she told the truth, she knew it would be to the utter ruin of herself and her dearest connections, and that she hoped he would not force her forwards;" that, since she appeared at the bar of the House, where suspicions were raised with respect to her character, she has lost all her Scholars, the number being twelve; that her goods have been seized for rent and taxes due, and that she is now actually in danger of a prison, her debts amounting to about a hundred and fifty pounds beyond the utmost extent of her means.

Now, though it is true, that the rent and taxes and debts were due previous to the Inquiry, to give evidence in which she was forced; though it is evident, that she must have been struggling with great difficulties before; still it is not less evident, that it is that circumstance which has, at once, disabled her from longer maintaining the struggle; for, in taking from her her scholars, it took from her the possibility of paying her Debts, it rendered her insolvency irretrievable, and, of course, brought all her creditors upon her.—Thus has this young woman, in whom, especially if we consider the circumstance of her family connections, it was no weak effort of virtue to set about and effect an establishment whereby to gain an honest livelihood, been completely ruined; reduced to misery almost as great as can be conceived, not by any fault of her own, nor even with the assistance of any foible, but merely by having been forced to appear as a Witness in a situation, which exposed all her connections and acquaintance.

Of the particulars relating to her pecuniary affairs I am informed under her own hand, through a gentleman whom I requested to make the inquiry of her; but, in any other respect I know of her no more than what is known by the public in general; and, if that public think, as I do, that her evidence, from first to last, was clear, consistent, and unshaken; that, after every effort had been made to find out grounds

of imputation against her character, not the smallest grounds were discovered; and that the only fault of her life imputed to her, by those even whose object it was to throw discredit upon her, was, her having lived upon terms of intimacy with Mrs. Clarke, with that Mrs. Clarke, in whose company she met with a Prince of the Blood, and with which Mrs. Clarke we find a Baroness, a General, and a Dr. of Divinity in the closest habits of intercourse and professed friendship, and of which Mrs. Clarke she was a relation: if this be the opinion of the public, I am persuaded there will be persons enough ready to lend a hand in lifting her from that ruin, which without such assistance, is inevitable.—I propose, if I should succeed in this Appeal to the compassion, and I must say, the justice, of the public, first to call her creditors together, and discharge her debts; then, with whatever remains, to purchase her something that she may be sure to enjoy for her life, jointly, I think, with her sister; because it is the ruined female, and not the witness, that we have it in contemplation to relieve, and to sustain.

Subscriptions will be received at the Banking House of MESSRS. BROWN, COBB, and Co. Lombard Street; by my Publisher, Mr. RICHARD BAGSHAW, 10 Brydges Street, Covent Garden; and by Mr. JOHN BUNN, Bookseller, 100 Pall Mall, who have Books opened for the purpose, and who will, to any gentlemen in the country, that may choose to subscribe, send receipts for the sums they receive. Each Subscriber will be so good as to leave his address, it being my intention to transmit to each, on the 1st of May, when I purpose to close the Subscription, an Account of what has been received, and also of the manner in which it has been expended.

WM. COBBETT.

* * I have to acknowledge the goodness of several Gentlemen, who have stepped forward to assist in this undertaking, especially Mr. TIMOTHY BROWN, who has kindly offered to receive Subscriptions at his Banking-house, and into which I have directed Messrs. Bagshaw and Budd to pay all that they may receive on this account.

OFFICIAL PAPERS.

SPANISH REVOLUTION.—*Palafox's Proclamation to the Arragonese.*—(Concluded from p. 256.)

2. That such towns as do not contribute all in their power to the relief of our present ne-

cessities, shall be treated as enemies to our king whose sovereign rights we defend, and their inhabitants of every rank shall be punished as traitors.—3. That every individual of the army of reserve, and the recruits of Arragon, already enrolled and regimented, who shall not join his corps, within the space of six days thereof, shall be treated as a deserter in time of war, and as such shall suffer the pains of law.—4. That the alcalds shall scrupulously examine the soldiers in their respective wards, who may not have so joined, and make a return of their names and the corps they belong to; and that the justices of the kingdom of Arragon do, under the responsibility of person and property, transmit an exact list of all the individuals of their jurisdiction, who have served in the army, distinguishing the cavalry from the infantry, and remarking their state of health and personal vigour.—5. That all who profess want of confidence in the chiefs of the people or the army, who make pasquinades, excite riots or disturbances, shall be immediately apprehended, and carried before the newly-appointed judge of the police, Don Santiago Penicela, who will pass judgment according to the times and critical circumstances in which the country is placed, and suitable to their crimes; imposing the punishment of death he shalt consult me.—6. That all the measures adopted shall be obeyed with religious respect, since they are all directed to the good of the country, which will recompence in more happy times the sacrifices we make, and which are so pleasing to God and the celestial protectress who guards us.—7. That all the houses shall be well supplied with cisterns and vessels of water, in order to be ready to assist in extinguishing any fire which may occur: and that the Alcaldes de Barrio shall in particular superintend this important preparation.—8. That the entrance and departure of persons by the gates shall be watched with the greatest care, recollecting that the enemy even assume our dress, and resort to every artifice, because they do not trust entirely to their force, though greatly superior in numbers.—9. That precisely three days shall be allowed for the departure of all the women, old men arrived at sixty, and all the boys not able to carry cartridges, with moderate equipages, for whose convenience orders have been is-

sued to all the towns and villages, to receive them with kindness, to supply their wants.—10. That all Frenchmen, who may happen to be within the city, shall be presented to the judge of the police, in order to be removed without the walls. All the women and children of the same nation shall be removed with their husbands and fathers; as also all the prisoners and deserters from the enemy's army, to places appointed for their reception.—11. To prevent those persons, whose virtue is respected by every catholic from being exposed to insult, I permit the nuns to proceed to occupy other convents, without the limits of the city and suburbs, where they may have an opportunity of devoting themselves, without interruption, to their holy exercise.

Twenty-Eighth Bulletin, of the French Army in Spain, (concluded from page 352.)

— — — — — The English Government is like the liar in the play, who has told the same untruth so often, that at last he believes it himself.—Lugo was pillaged and sacked by the enemy. We cannot impute these disasters to the English general: it is the usual and inevitable effect of forced marches and precipitate retreat. The inhabitants of the kingdoms of Leon and Galicia hold the English in horror. Under this head, the events that have taken place are equivalent to a great victory.—Zamora, whose inhabitants had been animated by the presence of the English, shut their gates against general Maupetet: general Dorneau proceeded against it with four battalions; he scaled the city, took it, and put the most guilty to the sword. Galicia is the province of Spain which manifests the best disposition, it receives the French as deliverers, who have relieved them at once from foreigners and from anarchy.—The bishop of Lugo, and the clergy of the whole province, manifest the wisest sentiments.—Valladolid has taken the oath to king Joseph. Six men, the leaders of revolt and massacre of the French, have been condemned to death. Five have been executed. The clergy asked pardon for the sixth, who is a father of four children. His Majesty commuted his sentence, and said, he wished thereby to testify his satisfaction of the good conduct of the secular clergy of Valladolid on several important occasions.